

REMARKS

Claims 1-11 are all the claims pending in the application. Of these claims, claims 1-1 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112 (second paragraph) as being incomplete for omitting essential structural cooperative relationships of elements. Claims 3 and 4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112 (second paragraph) as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject invention. Claims 1, 2, 4 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Roba, et al. (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2001/0020374). Claims 1 and 5-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Galy (U.S. Patent No. 6,629,7350). Claims 1 and 3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Batelaan (U.S. Patent No. 5,678,903). For the following reasons, Applicants respectfully traverse the Examiner's objections and rejections.

With respect to the first rejection under § 112 (second paragraph) as being incomplete for omitting essential structural cooperative relationships of elements, Applicants note that the only explanation of this rejection relates to the limitation in claim 9. Thus, to advance prosecution, and without prejudice, claim 9 has been canceled from the application. Applicants submit that the remaining claims fully comply with the requirements of § 112 (second paragraph). As recited in claim 1, the invention is directed to an anti-PMD system which includes a pulley which is contacted by the optical fiber and which is oscillated in the clockwise and counter-clockwise directions. Thus, it is not clear what the Examiner has in mind in rejecting claim 1. It is believed that the cancellation of claim 10 has overcome this rejection.

As to the § 112 (second paragraph) rejection of claims 3 and 4, it is believed that the above amendments to the claims overcomes this rejection. As to claim 9, there is no recitation of

“the oscillations.” Presumably, the Examiner meant to refer to claim 10, which has been canceled.

With respect to the prior art rejections, Applicants respectfully submit that the claims patentably distinguish over the prior art for the following reasons.

Applicants admit that Roba et al. achieves the object of reducing the PMD of the optical fiber (see paragraph 0018). As disclosed in paragraph 0047, the winding process of the fiber onto the pulley substantially made in the absence of sliding therebetween, is facilitated if the pulley is provided with a suitable profile, i.e. a substantially V-shaped groove, adapted to receive the optical fiber. The V-shaped groove comprises opposite side walls forming an angle in the range between 65 ° and 75 ° with the plane of symmetry π of the pulley.

In addition, as disclosed in paragraph 0049, the groove comprises a bottom surface which is essentially planar, or anyway having a radius of curvature considerably larger than the radius of the optical fiber, in such a way that the contact between the fiber and the bottom surface and one of the side walls, respectively, is essentially reduced to a point in cross section (See, also figures 3 and 4 and paragraphs 0074 and 0075). This disclosure in Roba et al., is in clear contrast with the wording of claim 1 as on file now, wherein is stated "... a portion of a peripheral external surface of the pulley in contact with the optical fiber during drawing is convex".

Roba et al. clearly teaches that groove 26 comprises a substantially planar bottom surface 27, wherein the bottom surface 27 has a width adapted to receive at one and the same time two portions of the fiber 100 lying side-by-side (see paragraph 0075). There is no suggestion in Roba et al. that the contact surface of the pulley is convex, as recited in claim 1 as on file now. This can also been seen in figure 4 of Roba et al.

Galy relates to a wheel primarily for a roller skate, especially for a skate whose wheels are aligned. This US document does not show any relationship with the subject of the present invention; it is directed to a different field of endeavor. In addition, this US document does not show any relationship with a fiber drawing process, let alone an anti-PMD system comprising a pulley adapted to apply a torque to an optical fiber during drawing of the optical fiber to reduce its PMD. Although Galy discloses a wheel with a peripheral external surface that is completely convex, Galy does not show any relationship with the present anti-PMD system. Therefore, the rejection on basis of Galy fails. Galy is directed to non-analogous art.

Batelaan relates to a resilient suspension device for a short track wheel comprising a resilient band entraining a pair of rollers. This US document does not relate to the various steps of fabricating optical fiber during a fiber drawing process. Furthermore, this US document does not teach or suggest to increase the torsion torque applied to an optical fiber to reduce the PMD of the optical fiber. Therefore, there is not technical relationship between the present invention and Batelaan. It too is directed to non-analogous art.

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

RESPONSE UNDER 37 C.F.R. §1.111
U.S. SERIAL NO.: 10/649,720

Atty. Docket No. Q76694

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,



Brian W. Hannon
Registration No. 32,778

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE
23373
CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: May 7, 2007